

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

MICHAEL KAY,

Plaintiff,

v.

WILLIAM HAACK, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:13-cv-1076-PK

ORDER

Michael H. Simon, District Judge.

United States Magistrate Judge Paul Papak issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on July 23, 2014. Dkt. 56. Judge Papak recommended that the Court grant the motions for summary judgment filed by the Defendants who are affiliated with the City of Vernonia (“City Defendants”) (Dkt. 29), filed by Defendant Theresa King (Dkt. 32), and filed by Defendant Dian Rubanoff (Dkt. 35). Judge Papak also recommended that the evidentiary objections informally asserted by the City Defendants be disregarded and Plaintiff’s request for judicial notice be granted in part and denied in part. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act (“Act”), the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C.

§ 636(b)(1)(C). If a party files objections to a magistrate’s findings and recommendations, “the

court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report[.]”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (the court must review de novo magistrate’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge Papak’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Judge Papak’s Findings and Recommendation, Dkt. 56. The summary judgment motions filed by Defendants (Dkts. 29, 32, & 35) are GRANTED. The City Defendants’ evidentiary objections are overruled and Plaintiff’s request for judicial notice is granted in part. This case is DISMISSED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 25th day of August, 2014.

/s/ Michael H. Simon
Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge